

**Remarks**

**Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the finality of this rejection, since claims 11-20 were not previously rejected. Further, applicants respectfully request a telephonic interview to discuss the issues presented herein.**

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1-20 remain pending.

In the Office Action dated March 20, 2008, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Drenan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,143,136). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse this rejection for the reasons below.

In one aspect of applicants' invention, a capability is provided within a communications environment for restricting access by client nodes of the environment to particular resources of a server node of the environment. Information provided at the server node over a communications medium via a trusted agent is used to determine which resources of the server node are accessible by one or more clients. In one example, these resources are physical resources, such as I/O devices of the communications environment. That is, in applicants' environment, physical resources of a server node are shared between a plurality of client nodes. Information provided by a trusted agent are used to determine the physical resources assigned to a given client node.

In one particular aspect, applicants claim a method of determining resources accessible to client nodes (e.g., independent claim 1). The method includes, for instance, receiving information at a server node via a communications medium, the communications medium usable in accessing data at the server node, the server node including a plurality of physical resources to be shared by a plurality of clients coupled to the server node; and using the information to determine one or more physical resources of the plurality of physical resources of the server node assigned to a given client node of the plurality of client nodes, wherein the client node is restricted access to the one or more determined physical resources such that one or more other physical resources of the plurality of physical resources is inaccessible to the client node. Thus, in this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, a server

node includes a plurality of physical resources that are to be shared by a plurality of clients coupled to the server node. Information received at the server node (e.g., an access table) is used to determine the one or more physical resources of the server node assigned to a given client node. The client node has restricted access to those one or more determined physical resources, such that one or more other physical resources of the server node are inaccessible to the client node. This is not described, taught or suggested in Drenan.

Although Drenan describes an access control mechanism for controlling access to a set of resources, Drenan does not describe, teach or suggest one or more aspects of applicants' claimed invention. For instance, Drenan does not describe, teach or suggest using said information to determine one or more physical resources of the plurality of physical resources of the server node (to be shared by a plurality of clients) assigned to a given client node, wherein the client node is restricted access to the one or more determined physical resources such that one or more other physical resources of the plurality of physical resources is inaccessible to the client node. Instead, in Drenan, as shown in FIG. 1, there is a set of resources in the collaboration environment that is accessible to each of the companies of the collaboration environment. That is, the entire set of resources is shared by all of the companies without distinction. This is very different from what is being claimed by applicants.

In applicants' claimed invention, one or more resources of the set of resources to be shared is inaccessible to a given client node. In particular, while physical resources are to be shared by a plurality of clients, only a portion of those resources is accessible to a given client. The remaining portion of the shared resources is not accessible to the client node at all. This is not described, taught or suggested in Drenan. In Drenan, all of the resources of the shareable set of resources are shared by the companies. There is no distinction in Drenan of resources within the set of resources being accessible to one company and inaccessible to another company. The set of resources that are to be shared are shared by all the companies.

Since Drenan fails to describe, teach or suggest at least this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that their invention is patentable over Drenan. Thus, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for independent

claim 1, and the other independent claims. Moreover, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features.

For all of the above reasons, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller

Blanche E. Schiller  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: May 20, 2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, New York 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579